



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,098	06/20/2006	Steffen Goletz	4652.1000-000	8158
21005	7590	05/05/2011	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			LEAVITT, MARIA GOMEZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/05/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/568,098	GOLETZ ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
MARIA LEAVITT	1633	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

(1) Anne Collins.

(3) Maria Leavitt.

(2) Laurence Shumway.

(4) Joseph Woitach.

Date of Interview: 2 May 2011
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner contacted Applicants' representative, Laurence Shumway, to discuss an amendment to the pending claims filed on 05/25/2010 to overcome rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 103, 35 USC § 102(b), 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and USC § 112 first paragraph –New matter, to set forth the claims in condition for allowance. Additionally, the examiner requested filing of a terminal disclaimer over US Patent 7,595,192 . Applicants' representative asserted that a TD over claims of US. Patent 7,595,192 was not necessary based on the initial restriction of the instant invention which was made final by the examiner in the office action filed on 01/27/2009. It was decided that a TD over US Patent 7,595,192 was not necessary as the product by process lysate of claim 1 of US Patent 7,595,192 was a distinct invention from the instant claimed cell lines. Further, Applicants approved an examiner's amendment to claims 1 , 3 (c) and 11.

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Maria Leavitt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)